

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

1516 NINTH STREET
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814-5512



May 18, 1999

Dear Meeting Attendees:

SUMMARY OF THE APRIL 22, 1999 DATA RESPONSE WORKSHOP

Enclosed is the staff's summary of the Sunrise Cogeneration and Power Project data response workshop that was held at the Energy Commission's offices in Sacramento, California on April 22, 1999. This summary is an informal record of the discussions that took place. It has been distributed to all project staff and to all other attendees identified on the meeting attendee list attached to the summary. The summary provides the meeting participants with the opportunity to correct information that was misunderstood in the hope of having good communication and an efficient process. If you would like to make any changes or additions to the summary, please send them to me in writing. I will see that they are placed in the project file and that the appropriate staff and other meeting attendees receive them. Please call me at (916) 654-4242 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Kristina C. Bergquist
Project Manager
Energy Facility Siting
and Environmental Protection

Enclosure

cc: Proof of Service List

May 18, 1999

Dear Meeting Attendees:

SUMMARY OF THE APRIL 22, 1999 DATA RESPONSE WORKSHOP

Enclosed is the staff's summary of the Sunrise Cogeneration and Power Project data response workshop that was held at the Energy Commission's offices in Sacramento, California on April 22, 1999. This summary is an informal record of the discussions that took place. It has been distributed to all project staff and to all other attendees identified on the meeting attendee list attached to the summary. The summary provides the meeting participants with the opportunity to correct information that was misunderstood in the hope of having good communication and an efficient process. If you would like to make any changes or additions to the summary, please send them to me in writing. I will see that they are placed in the project file and that the appropriate staff and other meeting attendees receive them. Please call me at (916) 654-4242 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Kristina C. Bergquist
Project Manager
Energy Facility Siting
and Environmental Protection

Enclosure

cc: Proof of Service List

SUNRISE COGENERATION AND POWER PROJECT

Data Response Workshop

April 22, 1999

MEETING SUMMARY

A workshop was held on April 22, 1999 at the Energy Commission, Hearing Room B, to discuss the data responses made by the applicant, Texaco Global Gas & Power (TGG&P), on March 31, 1999 and April 15, 1999. The discussion began with those questions related to transmission system engineering, specifically what information is needed for inclusion in the Preliminary Staff Assessment (PSA).

Transmission System Engineering

The discussion began with the applicant's concerns with a project schedule item indicating that a Detailed Facilities Study was to be completed by March 24, 1999. The applicant's data response indicated a Preliminary Facilities Study would be complete by the end of May and would include the analysis that both staff and the Cal-ISO had requested. This study will also include downstream electric facility requirements. A Detailed Facilities Study that analyzes everything but the costs of specific interconnection equipment will be complete by the middle of July. The first piece should suffice in order for staff to complete the transmission system engineering section of the PSA and the rest should arrive in time for the Final Staff Assessment (FSA). The applicant also mentioned that they had included the area around the Midway Substation in their spring survey in case new facilities were required in that area.

There was also a brief discussion on what a Preliminary Facilities Study and a Detailed Facilities Study are. There are not strict definitions for these studies. Staff needs more than the preliminary and less than the detailed study to complete its analysis for certification. Staff requires an identification of downstream facilities as early in the process as possible because those facilities effect many of the other staff members analyzing the impacts of the project. TGG&P will provide what both staff and the Cal-ISO need for the FSA.

Indirect and Cumulative Impacts

Energy Commission staff asserted that any new oil field development arising from the Sunrise project would be considered an indirect impact. However, the Texaco California, Inc.(TCI) Main Utility Corridor and 20" diameter interconnecting natural gas line pipeline are now excluded from the project, but will be evaluated to determine cumulative impacts. TGG&P maintains its position that no facility owned and operated by the thermal host, TCI, should be included in the discussion of indirect impacts. The applicant emphasized the corporate separateness of TGG&P and TCI, both of which are subsidiaries of the parent company, Texaco, Inc..

Worker Safety and Transmission Line Safety and Nuisance

The Energy Commission is required to insure that oilfield workers will not be working near high voltage lines. Staff asked if the applicant was aware of the regulations concerning active and inactive wells. TGG&P intends to route the transmission line away from existing wells. The applicant will send the oil well information to staff's contact (Joe Austin, (661) 322-4031) at the Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR) and confirm to staff that DOGGR has received the necessary information.

Facility Design

The applicant wanted a clarification of the information staff wants to see in response to the two outstanding data requests. The first item (data request #32) dealt with the requirements for performing dynamic analysis on selected major structures and equipment. The applicant agreed to provide a list by April 30, 1999 and staff and the applicant agreed that the list would include the HRSG, turbine foundations, exhaust stack, the water storage tank and any of the major pumps. Staff informed the applicant that when this information is provided, it will satisfy data request #32.

The second item dealt with the design storm. In responding to staff's earlier data request (data request #28), the applicant indicated that the onsite drainage facilities would be designed to a 10-year storm. The storm duration, however, was not included. The applicant indicated that they would provide staff with the storm duration to satisfy staff's data request by April 30, 1999.

Surface Waters

Staff informed the applicant that they should contact the Kern County Flood Control Department to verify that the storm intensities and durations that they propose to use in the surface water portion of the Application for Certification (AFC) are acceptable to the Kern County. Staff informed the applicant that Kern County uses two different storm events, one for on-site drainage and water retention calculations and the other for flood control. Staff said that the applicant should get a letter from Kern County confirming the intensity and duration of the storms used. Staff pointed out that the UBC '97 and CBC '98 only allow the on-site grading to have a minimum slope of 1%, and not 0.5%, as specified in the AFC. Staff also said that the Energy Commission would follow Kern County's lead with respect to the intensity and duration of the storms. Staff asked if the date for submittal of the revised drainage and grading plan was still set for April 30, 1999, and the applicant responded in the affirmative.

Cultural Resources

Staff requested, and the applicant agreed to provide, the location of the steam injection wells. The applicant stated the locations of the steam injection wells are not known at this time. Staff suggested that TGG&P may already have a map on which they could simply place the location of the wells. (Data Request #19)

Staff reiterated that it had asked for documentation and studies pertinent to permitting process conducted for the TCI Main Utility Corridor. After some discussion, TGG&P said that they would provide a copy of the U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Caliente Resource Management Plan Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), dated May 1997. (Data Request #20)

Staff questioned a reference in data response #20 that asserted that there were no cultural resources based on historical BLM permit actions and company personnel knowledge. Staff requested copies of the permits that were referenced. TGG&P responded that the information referenced was contained in the BLM EIS. The applicant was not able to provide the names of the knowledgeable company personnel.

Staff asked if a literature search was previously conducted for the .25 mile area along each side of the TCI Main Utility Corridor. Sunrise responded in Data Response, Set 1A, that "No literature search or cultural resource surveys were conducted, and to TCI's knowledge, none was required. Staff asked TGG&P to conduct a literature search for the area within .25 mile of the TCI Main Utility Corridor. TGG&P responded that the information should be available in the BLM EIS they said they would provide. Energy Commission staff will review the BLM EIS and make additional requests based on the information received. (Data Request #21)

No further data needed for Data Request #22.

Staff requested information concerning alternate routes, but it was not provided in the TGG&P response to the data request. TGG&P said that the information concerning alternate routes would be delivered on 4/29/99. (Data Request #23)

Staff indicated that information received in response to this data request raised additional questions. It was not clear to staff which portions of the cultural resources site, near Valley Acres Substation, indicated in figure 23-4, were previously discovered and recorded and which were recently identified by their consultant's survey. The applicant will provide a discussion of the site by the cultural resources specialist. The discussion will serve to clarify the boundaries of the site. TGG&P indicated that they planned to avoid the cultural site by locating the substation elsewhere. (Data Request #24)

TGG&P had already agreed to provide alternate route information in their workshop response to Data Request #23. (Data Request #25)

No additional information was requested for Data Request #26

A portion of the applicant's response to Data Request #27 stated that some new roads and spur roads would be constructed early in the construction phase of the project. (Data Request #27)

Staff asked for information concerning the location and types of the new roads and the spur roads. The applicant responded that the road information would be provided in June 1999.

Staff indicated that there was no information provided concerning the transmission line after it leaves the Valley Acres Substation and loops the PG&E and DWR transmission line. In fact, it appears that these lines will impact cultural resources. Staff questioned whether or not the lines had been surveyed. TGG&P responded that the lines were not surveyed due to an oversight and the information would be forthcoming. All information will be provided by April 30, 1999, except for the surveys which will be provided in early June 1999.

Biological Resources

Staff went through each of the applicant's data responses. Staff explained how it would proceed with the identification of the project's indirect and cumulative impacts. It was explained how the Energy Commission has handled similar cases (Midway-Sunset and Sycamore cogeneration projects) with regards to quantifying indirect effects. A total of the projected permanent and temporary habitat impacts was presented, and the applicant was informed that, currently, approximately 170 acres would need to be mitigated. This number is based upon an identification of temporary and permanent impacts to habitat, followed by an application of various compensation ratios. Staff also mentioned that additional compensation would probably be required for the project's indirect and cumulative impacts.

Staff explained that it was very interested in coming to an agreement on how best to identify the project's indirect and cumulative impacts to biological resources. The applicant seemed to understand staff's concerns, and indicated that they were interested in working with staff to develop the analysis. Staff encouraged the applicant to continue to develop the BRMIMP.

Staff volunteered to provide the applicant with information about the Center for Natural Lands Management (CNLM), a private, non-profit land conservation organization. CNLM currently manages the Lokern Preserve in western Kern County, and staff recommended that the applicant seriously consider providing any mitigation funds to CNLM.

The applicant announced that a meeting with the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) to discuss agency coordination, 2081(b) and Streambed Alteration permits, and schedules had been scheduled for April 30, 1999 in Fresno at the CDFG office. Staff assured the applicant that it would be in attendance at that meeting. BLM has not yet requested consultation with the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service.

Visual Resources

Staff noted that the map (Sheet 2), provided in Data Response 73, of existing transmission lines within one mile of the proposed transmission line route showed the 70 kV Taft-Elk Hills line (Route E on the map) as ending before reaching Taft. Staff requested that the applicant provide a revised map showing the remainder of the line within one mile of the proposed transmission line route. The applicant agreed to provide such a revision.

In regard to Data Response 75, Staff requested a more specific description of the existing setting in the vicinity of where the proposed transmission line route crosses State Route 119. The applicant agreed to provide such a description and also proposed to include photographs showing a panoramic view of the vicinity.

Data Response 76 stated that the AFC's statement that viewers are accustomed to industrial facilities in the area applies to the crossing of State Route 119 (SR 119). Staff questioned whether that statement was accurate in regard to recreational travelers, mentioned in Data Response 69. The applicant agreed to clarify their response. The CURE representative asked for the percentage of travelers that were recreational. The applicant stated that such information was not available. The applicant also clarified that, although Data Response 69 states that according to Kern County and CalTrans staff there is "some" recreation-related travel on SR 119 and 33, those staff had actually told the applicant that the number of recreational travelers was minimal. Staff requested that a written elaboration on the number of recreational travelers be provided. The applicant agreed.

Hazardous Material

The technical feasibility of using a water curtain to mitigate an accidental release of anhydrous ammonia was discussed. It was agreed that such an approach is probably not feasible.

Staff advised that further refinement of modeling should probably be undertaken before further mitigation is considered. Staff suggested that the probability of accidental release during loading should be evaluated to determine if the risk of a release is plausible and if the risk may be low enough to be considered acceptable.

Staff further suggested that the analysis should reflect the joint probability of failure of both an excess flow valve and some part of the interconnecting apparatus. They indicated that they would pursue this approach. It is anticipated that the revised analysis will be submitted on April 30, 1999. CURE asked about whether assumptions are based on the life of the project or per year. Staff said it should be based on the life of the project.

Air Quality

The applicant was informed that their data response to Data Request #4, which asked for construction data on the TCI Main Utility Corridor, was not adequate. The response was that the TCI Main Utility Corridor would be completed by 1999. TGG&P said that they did not see the need for this information since the facility was currently undergoing construction and construction emissions were not going to coincide with any other emissions. Staff stated that it needs this information in order to complete the CEQA analysis.

Response to Data Request #6 was not satisfactory since it did not answer the question. Staff had asked for the emissions of devices drawing off the TCI Main Utility Corridor or contributing to it. The response was that those emissions were

already part of the background in the PSD. Staff asked them for some clarification on their response, but TGG&P couldn't provide any.

The applicant and staff then discussed how this information would be used. Staff stated that Energy Commission management has not yet decided on exactly what would be indirect impacts and what would be cumulative impacts. Staff indicated that there was a dialog with technical staff indicating that the TCI Main Utility Corridor would be cumulative and the oil field would be indirect. The applicant and staff got into a general discussion of how staff would analyzed the project impacts. The two ideas presented were "the zone of influence" and "a percentage of the total TCI Main Utility Corridor." TGG&P preferred the former.

CURE asked for access to the confidential air quality information. Staff said that it would be reviewing the District Banking action regarding the Emission Reduction Credits. CURE's response was that was another reason that they wanted to see the filing.

Socioeconomics

TGG&P is using entirely local contractors to build the TCI Main Utility Corridor and the 20-inch diameter interconnecting natural gas pipeline. For the estimate of non-local workers for the Sunrise project, the applicant used the assumptions from the La Paloma Generation Project for the rationale and backup calculations.

Soils and Water Resources

TCI is negotiating with Valley Waste Disposal Company regarding wastewater disposal. When an agreement is reached, TCI will provide a copy to staff.

Sunrise Cogeneration and Power Project

Data Response and Issues Workshop

April 22, 1999

List of Attendees

Jeff Harris
Ellison & Schneider
2015 H Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Don Mundy
Black & Veatch
11900 E. Cornell, Suite 300
Aurora, CO 80014

David Stein
Radian International
1990 N. California, #500
Walnut Creek, CA 94596

Don Muroaka
Radian International
10389 Old Placerville Road
Sacramento, CA 95837

Paul Dinkel
Texaco Global Gas & Power
2255 N. Ontario Street
Burbank, CA 91504

Steve M. Clark
Black & Veatch
12701 W. 116
Overland Park, KS 66211

Mervyn Soares
Texaco
P.O. Box 81438
Bakersfield, CA 93380

Mike Kelly
Vector Environmental
P.O. Box 10447
Bakersfield, CA 93389

Kate Poole
CURE
651 Gateway Blvd., #900
S. San Francisco, CA 94080

Jennifer Costanza
Texaco Legal Department
2255 N. Ontario
Burbank, CA 91504

Craig Jackson
Texaco Exploration &
Production
Box 5197-x
Bakersfield, CA 93388

William Dailey
Texaco Exploration &
Production
Box 5197-x
Bakersfield, CA 93388

Arlene L. Ichien
CEC
1516 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Steve Baker
CEC
1516 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Gary Walker
CEC
1516 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Ean O'Neill
CEC
1516 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Ellie Townsend-Smith
CEC
1516 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Mark Hesters
CEC
1516 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Rick York
CEC
1516 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Stephen Kostka
McCathen, Doyle, Brown &
Emerson
1331 N. California Blvd.
Walnut Creek, CA 94549

Caryn Hough
CEC
1516 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Julie Way
Sunrise Project/Texaco
2255 N. Ontario
Burbank, CA 91501

Eileen Allen
CEC
1516 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Roger E. Johnson
CEC
1516 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

